



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ED
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,969	09/30/2003	David M. Callaghan	03AB002/ALBRP323US	4944
7590	07/21/2005		EXAMINER	
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204			NGUYEN, TAI T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2632	
DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/674,969	CALLAGHAN, DAVID M.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tai T. Nguyen	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 10-31 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected claimed invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 27, 2005. Applicant did not argue the restriction requirement, thus the election is treated as being without traverse.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, applicant should clarify how the configuration device is connected to a second power line and able to communicate with a controller over the first and second power line.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strom et al. (US 4,642,607).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Strom et al. disclose a system for controller configuration and programming (figure 1) comprising:

at least one controller (20, 24) connected to a power line (10, col. 3, lines 19-20);
a configuration device (44) connected to a second power line (16), wherein the configuration device communicate with the controller over the first and second power lines to enable remote controller configuration and programming (col. 3, lines 37-49).
Strom et al. disclose everything claimed except for the explicit disclosure of the remote configuration and programming. Since Strom et al. disclose the configuration device having a computer interface module (40), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the configuration device could be at a remote location.

Regarding claim 2, Strom et al. disclose the controller and the configuration device utilizing the power lines interface therebetween (col. 3, lines 1-49).

Regarding claim 3, Strom et al. disclose the interface contains a unique identifier and/or hex address (col. 4, lines 49-66), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the hex address could be considered as a serial number.

Regarding claim 4, Strom et al. disclose the interface being contained within the controller (col. 3, lines 15-29).

Regarding claim 5, Strom et al. disclose the modules using binary control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the control would interface as a PLC (col. 3, lines 15-29) in order to provide digital communication with the configuration device.

Regarding claim 7, Strom et al. disclose the configuration device configuring the at least one controller via download/exchange data (col. 3, lines 37-49).

Regarding claims 8-9, Strom et al. disclose everything claimed except for the explicit showing of the downloaded/exchanged data being a software program/webpage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a software program/webpage for the downloaded/exchanged data for the purpose of implementing system wide instructions.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mansfield, Jr. et al. (US 6,441,723) and Le van Suu (US 5,796,607).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am-5:00pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tai T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2632

July 18, 2005